DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 074 914 HE 003 882

AUTHOR	Cheit, Earl F.
TITLE	Coming of Middle Age in Higher Education.
INSTITUTION	Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	13 Nov 72
NOTE	22p.
AVAILABLE FROM	American Association of State Colleges and Universities, One Dupont Circle, Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20036; National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, One Dupont Circle, Suite 710, Washington, D.C. 20036 (free)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Administration; Educational Finance; *Educational Planning; *Educational Problems; *Financial Problems; *Higher Education

ABSTRACT

The major financial difficulties that have beset higher education within recent years have heralded the end of "the golden years" for colleges and universities. Institutions seeking to meet the continuing academic needs of students in a time when there is no money for new staffing, programs and buildings, are facing hard choices. The decisions that are made will affect the entire complexion of higher education for years to come. In this address, the author points out many of the problems that educators must face and plan for if they are to make feasible plans for the future of their institutions. (HS)

ED 074914

Coming of Middle Age in Higher Education

An Address by
Earl F. Cheit

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Earl F. Cheit
Program Advisor
Higher Education and Research
The Ford Foundation
New York, New York

Coming of Middle Age in Higher Education

Address to Joint Session

American
Association of
State Colleges and
Universities

National
Association of
State Universities and
Land-Grant Colleges

November 13, 1972
Washington, D. C.

Introduction

The major financial difficulties that have beset higher education within recent years have heralded the end of "the golden years" for colleges and universities. Institutions seeking to meet the continuing academic needs of students in a time when there is no money for new staffing, programs and buildings are facing hard choices. The decisions that are made will affect the entire complexion of higher education for years to come.

In his address to a joint session of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges in November, 1972, Earl F. Cheit, program advisor in the Department of Higher Education and Research of The Ford Foundation, pointed out many of the problems that educators must face. Dr. Cheit, author of the Carnegie Commission report, *The New Depression in Higher Education,* is currently on leave from his post as professor of business administration and research economist at the University of California at Berkeley.

Because of the pertinence of Dr. Cheit's statement to all who are concerned about the future of the nation's colleges and universities, the two associations felt that it should be made available to a larger audience.

Additional copies available upon request.

COMING OF MIDDLE AGE IN HIGHER EDUCATION

When academic men and women gather to talk about their administrative work these days, they tend to become nostalgic. Not for the immediate past, to be sure. Not for those turbulent times my Berkeley colleagues call "the bad old days." But rather for an earlier time and earlier conditions—for the conditions of a decade ago memorable for their possibilities, which now apparently are lost. How much easier it would be to solve the problems of today if we had the money of yesterday. The talk may concern either new policies—creating opportunities for women or experimenting with the doctor of arts degree—or the traditional concerns—helping a new Ph.D. in history in the job market or finding money for freshman seminars. Soon, not later, someone will summarize the situation with the lament: "Ten years too late."

"... the golden years' for higher education, the decade that ended with 1968 ... had problems, of course. But they were primarily the agreeable problems of growth: staffing, building, new programming."

Anyone who has spent at least the last ten years professing or administering on campus understands immediately that wistful reference to what Hans Jenny calls "the golden years" for higher education, the decade that ended with 1968. The "golden years" had problems, of course. But they were primarily the agreeable problems of growth: staffing,

building, new programming. Now the problems of growth are all but gone and are evolving into the problems of adjustment. A glance at the new problems makes obvious why there is nostalgia for the old.

- The problem of how to bring new faculty members in is becoming the problem of how to counsel old ones out. Those happy recruitment parties at the scholarly conventions are being replaced by dreary technical meetings on the actuarial foundations of early retirement.
- Those pioneering building problems—how to build space to house new faculty and new programs—have become the burdensome management problems of how to find budgeted activities to fill those buildings, and how to live with that most deceptive of euphemisms, deferred maintenance.
- Young faculty members were told their problem was to meet the established teaching, research and service standards and their reward would be advancement to tenure. But now their problem is that we cannot always keep the promise, and our problem is that they are forming unions.
- Until recently, a persuasive argument for starting a new program was that "someone else is doing it." Today that fact is a respectable argument for *not* starting it.
- The problem of what to do with new money has become the problem of how to hang on to the old. Faculty positions that could not be filled at budgeted ranks, or filled at all, produced "budgetary savings," that most valuable of all academic resources, new money. New money was used to fund academic innovation and even whole departments, with pride. Now that enrollment trends are threatening to throw support formulas into reverse, the remaining money is being used to fund management innovation and even whole management systems, with prayer.
- In the office of student admissions, until recently the problem was how to buy. Today the problem is becoming how to sell. A recent advertisement in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* says "Learn How To Recruit More New Students For Your Institution." Admissions procedures that could humble the

most confident applicant are today fast on the way to becoming candidates for human relations awards.

• As for research grants, they have always been popular, but as John Gardner recalls from his service as Secretary of HEW during those "golden years," academics were particular about the way they got the money. They insisted on the method he called the "leave it on the stump" approach. Now there is moss on the stump. The new way is the accountable way. At the annual meeting of the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada this year, the Director of Statistics Canada set the tone by warning his colleagues that the "future will be an era of no growth," and the entire meeting was devoted to accountability in research funding.

Put in language the State Department is said to find useful, our plans for the campus were "overtaken by events." With a fair degree of confidence a few years ago we projected student enrollment, assumed financial support and predicted for higher education a gradual transition to organizational maturity by the end of the decade of the 1970s. It was to have been a slow transition to life in the steady state. But instead events rushed us into the problems of middle age adjustment in the first years of the decade. The transition could hardly be called graceful. Its rites of passage are no more memorable than the last budget fight, which on further reflection, seems indistinguishable from the budget fight that preceded it.

Academics trained to treat organizations for growing pains must now find remedies for the pains of middle age. "Ten years too late" is not a penitent nor a contrite cry, although some say it should be. It's a wistful reminiscence about the future. A full treatise on this academic change of life has not yet been done, but when it is, it could well be called "The Groans of Academe," because one of its conclusions will have to be that although growing pains hurt, they are not nearly as acute as the pains of middle age.

BEGINNING OF MIDDLE AGE

When did middle age set in? No single date marks the first signs, but they first began to trouble some

institutions late in the 1960s, and have become more general since. The important fact is that they came much earlier than we had expected. Long-range planners in higher education have known that, given the present population which they could count, and enrollment rates which they thought they could predict, enrollment would grow steadily through the decade of the 1970s, level off at the end of the decade, remain fairly stable through the 1980s and then climb again. Colleges and universities would have to scramble to make ends meet, but as they had done in the past, they could continue to finance this growth and so live at their accustomed life style.

People who looked ahead saw adjustment problems occurring as growth ceased. What they did not foresee was the declining rate of income growth, the rising cost pressures and the changes in attitudes toward higher education, all of which began to occur in the late 1960s. Any one of these factors alone would have caused some adjustment problems; together they produced the circumstances that overtook those long-range plans. Today they are forcing upon us an accelerated course in the character building potential of retrenchment.

The growing divergence between cost and income put a heavy premium on tuition. Doubly valuable because it is the only income source that institutions can control directly, and the only "new" (uncommitted) money, tuition was pushed up, and pushed up faster than the rise in per capita disposable income. This increase in tuition (and other charges) together with changed attitudes, a slack job market and a new draft situation, slowed down the rates of enrollment growth.

During the decade of the 1960s enrollment grew at an average annual rate of about 12 percent. An average growth rate of about six percent was predicted for the 1970s. Dr. Garland G. Parker, the authority on enrollment figures, estimates this year's enrollment growth at two percent. Canadian colleges and universities, whose enrollment also grew at the average annual rate of about twelve percent during the 1960s, predicted an enrollment

increase of five percent this year. Instead, it has gone up one-half of one percent.

Law schools and medical schools are, of course, growing rapidly, as are a few other special areas on university campuses—forestry and architecture, for example, and most community colleges are still growing at least as rapidly as expected, as are a smaller number of four-year institutions.

But except for a fortunate few, all four-year colleges and universities are affected. It is now reported that the proportion of state budgets going to higher education has stopped growing; and that in two-thirds of the states, the proportion of the budget going to higher education is actually declining. The prospects for substantial new federal funds are poor. For most institutions the transition away from incremental budgeting has begun. Although the degree of adjustment varies from campus to campus, in all of them the work of administrators and the worries of academics have changed enough to render them nostalgic. Plainly put, the college president's job formerly was to give things away; now he must increasingly take things away. The faculty, accustomed to worrying about trading up, now worries about being traded off. That is middle age with a vengeance!

TIMES OF INTENSIVE GROWTH

No one can say we were totally without warning, early or distant. Articles and speeches were current about academic life in the steady state. One of President Clark Kerr's favorite themes—and he came back to it often in his speeches on the Berkeley campus—was growth and its evolution. Looking ahead through the 1960s and early 1970s, he said the university would be going through a period of "extensive growth." But after that, late in the 1970s, the university would enter a new period of "intensive growth." I remember the speeches clearly; I distinctly remember enjoying and applauding them; I now realize that I did not really understand what they meant.

Certainly there was no reason for alarm. Like the "steady state," the concept of "intensive growth" had an agreeable sound. In any case, "intensive

growth" was still a long way off. What was hard to understand at the time, but is painfully clear today, is that it meant growth through conscious choice. It meant change, not by addition, but by substitution, or even by contraction.

Perhaps President Kerr meant to tell his faculty that intensive growth is partly the growth of character that comes from making hard choices. If that was his intention, he chose a method that was too subtle. It took more than subtlety to raise consciousness of choice in the "golden years." That is not the way we were inducted into the system. My induction on moving West in 1957, along with a couple of hundred thousand or so fellow migrants, came from a colleague at a welcoming luncheon on the Berkeley campus.

"There are three things a newcomer to California ought to understand," he explained. "First, you will now enjoy an entirely new relationship to nature. Until now, she was sometimes your adversary. Now she is your ally. Here nature is always on your side.

"Second," he continued, "we are terribly provincial. When we speak of the government, we don't mean Washington, D. C., we mean Sacramento.

"Finally, and most important, we have repealed the first principle of economics, that dealing with choice. Here is how we handle it. If there are two ways of doing something, we don't agonize about which way to do it. We do both."

Whether or not other new faculty members stumbled into such a heady welcome in the "golden years," the objective conditions on campus could not help but generate optimism. Malcolm Moos, president of the University of Minnesota, describes the "affluent Fifties and Sixties" as a time of "overflowing public coffers from which we virtually shovelled out at will the resources we felt necessary to finance education . . ." Even allowing for the fact that, from the perspective of today, those past years may seem a bit more golden than they in fact were, it was a time not likely to generate serious responses to lectures about intensive growth, nor to articles about the problems of the steady state. The warnings

were there, but the conditions that would make them real were not. Now we have the reality.

Facing up to reality is difficult for all organizations. They prefer to change the easiest way – by growing. None like to discard activities. It is easier to decide what to do than it is to decide what to do first or than it is to decide what to give up. Our governments, state and federal, tend to be least disciplined about these questions, so they grow. Business is not much different. In his book, *The Age of Discontinuity*, Peter Drucker reminds us that "Businessmen are just as sentimental about yesterday as bureaucrats. They are just as reluctant to abandon anything. They are just as likely to respond to the failure of a product or program by doubling the efforts invested in it."

For colleges and universities, facing the reality of change without growth is doubly difficult. They are complex organizations of professionals. Peer judgment is an essential ingredient for their most important decisions. Administrators are appointed under a corporate theory, but their academic success depends in large part on their ability to lead by a parliamentary model. By comparison, the organizational problems of business seem simple. Many of the achievements we prize most in our academic institutions can be traced to their decentralized structure, their autonomy. But that form of planning and spending is not well suited to the problem of adjusting program to more restricted circumstances. Moreover, educational institutions do not have performance measures that could facilitate judgment of their effectiveness. As of now, there is little agreement about the value judgments which would be implicit in such measures.

Finally, the problems of adjustment are more difficult in colleges and universities than in most other organizations because they have been undermanaged. If no one has offered the colleges and universities as examples of impeccable management, neither has anyone made a convincing case that their problems are primarily ones of bad management. As their alumni and friends discovered during

the periods of campus disturbances, the problem is that they have been undermanaged. By any reasonable criterion of administrative support one might apply, colleges and universities compare quite favorably with governmental and even with industrial organizations. That is part of their problem. As recently as eight years ago, one of the nation's leading institutions was operating without a budget. That is an extreme example, to be sure, but it is one that brings knowing and sympathetic nods from academic administrators. Their own institutions, in their own ways, have also been undermanaged. In higher education, facing up depends on catching up.

COST-INCOME SQUEEZE

Ask the president of any college or university today what his major concern is, and in one way or another, he will tell you that he is working on the choices forced by the cost-income situation on campus. Listen to the conversations at meetings of the various associations in higher education. Whether it is the Association of University Presses, or the National Collegiate Athletic Association, or the learned societies, or this meeting of Land-Grant Colleges, State Colleges and State Universities, the conversations are never far away from the money problem and the adjustments it forces on the campus.

Lyman Glenny, Director of the Berkeley Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, recently warned that the process of adjustment was not moving fast enough; that on some campuses there was still more concern with prestige than with flexibility; that expansionist tendencies are still evident; that some faculty members seem to view the present situation as merely a temporary aberration from the "golden years" pattern.

Scratch a president who sighs "ten years too late" and you may still find a "golden years" builder yearning for a few new Ph.D. programs and a new medical center. But the odds are growing that you will find a new-wave cost-accountant. Or more accurately, a cost-finder, who is busy turning the planning process around. Instead of beginning with aspirations for prestige, leaving eventual costs and

educational objectives to take care of themselves, he now begins with the objectives, and the unit costs had better be justified by them or the project will be scrapped.

"... it is becoming hard to find a campus not involved in reconsideration of its priorities, for all know that sooner or later they will have hard choices to make."

At the University of Minnesota, Malcolm Moos has a program he calls R and R. His R and R does not mean rest and recreation. It means retrenchment and reallocation. Not every campus is doing as much, and it is not always easy for an outsider to know just how much, if anything, is going on because on some campuses the process proceeds under euphemisms. But it is becoming hard to find a campus not involved in reconsideration of its priorities, for all know that sooner or later they will have hard choices to make.

This effort to improve choice by the use of management methods has produced the newest movement on campus—the management movement. The signs are all around us. Look at the titles of popular recent books: *Efficiency in Liberal Education; Efficient College Management; The More Efficient Use of Resources.* The advertisements in educational journals reveal a growing market for consulting services in management.

Consider the important new organizations. From its relatively modest beginnings just a few years ago, the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) at the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE) at Boulder is today a burgeoning force in higher education. The National Center convened its first national assembly just two months ago (September 13-15, 1972), and although registration of a few hundred was expected, about 700 academic administrators from all over the country came.

What were the program topics that justified so much travel at this time of tight budgets? "Making Decisions with NCHEMS Tools"; "Faculty Activity Analysis"; "Modern Planning and Management Techniques: Implications for Implementation and Organization"; "Information Exchange Procedures: Significance for Decision Makers"; "Cost Finding Principles." It was one of the first national meetings of the new management movement that is gaining

momentum in higher education. The National Center's meeting was clearly a consciousness-raising session, an important early phase in the life of all movements. Every president who reads the incoming mail knows that similar sessions are being held in all parts of the nation. Some parts of this movement—the Common Fund for example—are devoted to increasing income. Most are concerned with costs.

So sensitive have we become to the forms of this movement that any president who cannot say he is using cost-simulating models described by powerful-sounding acronyms like SEARCH or DRIVE or BAMN (no endorsements here) goes unarmed these days to meetings of alumni, Regents and especially to meetings of presidents, where it could well be assumed he is not up to date, or even worse, that he is not conscious of costs. For it now seems that as a result of the management movement, Consciousness IV is making its appearance on the nation's campuses—it's cost consciousness.

LONG-TERM PHENOMENON

If the colleges and universities were being forced to adjust to a short-term money problem only, I think that even at this early date, the management movement could be proclaimed a partial success. When hard figures do become available, I believe they will show that the management efforts are making progress, both in holding down the rate of growth of expenditures and in raising more income than would otherwise be the case. Some budget disasters have been avoided, others at least postponed. My overall impression is that the amount of progress is substantial and its consequences significant.

But we are not dealing with a short-term problem. The optimists say the 1970s will be bad; the pessimists say the 1980s—with no enrollment growth to justify income growth—will be worse. Among academic administrators there is general recognition that this is a long-term phenomenon. This explains why one can find nostalgia for the old life style even among those administrators not yet forced to adopt

the new one. They know that whatever their differences in size, aspirations and degree of present difficulty, all institutions will be counting on management methods to help with their money problems for the foreseeable future.

When the problems of adjustment are looked at in this longer run perspective, the importance of attitudes toward education becomes apparent. In higher education, issues of money lead eventually to issues of purpose. Although the immediate adjustments of the kind I listed at the beginning of these remarks were for the most part dominated by tactical, fiscal considerations, their longer run solution like the condition of higher education itself, depends upon basic attitudes toward higher education. And as I noted earlier, the colleges and universities are dealing with a money problem and an attitude problem. They are an interrelated product of growth, most of which has been absorbed by the Land-Grant and State institutions.

"... the ability of individual campuses to meet the educational needs of their potential students, to be of good quality and in some cases, to exist, will in considerable measure be determined by how the emerging, conflicting views about education are reconciled in the future."

In higher education, as in other areas of our national life, we are being forced to come to terms with growth and the attitudes about it. In so far as one can tell, the burden of changed attitudes toward education seems to be rather evenly distributed among the nation's institutions of different types. But the ability of individual campuses to meet the educational needs of their potential students, to be of good quality and in some cases, to exist, will in considerable measure be determined by how the emerging, conflicting views about education are reconciled in the future.

This future situation has special relevance for Land-Grant Colleges and the State Colleges and Universities. They have a major stake in the outcome, of course. But, in addition, these institutions are in a strong position to provide leadership in reconciling the main attitude conflicts due to growth. Let's take a look at growth in this light.

GROWTH ON CAMPUS

The dominant fact about American higher education is its rapid and successful growth. In the period since World War II, higher education was transformed from an elite to a mass enterprise. In 1940,

the median education level nationally was 8.4 years. Today, as *The New York Times* just reported, "half of all adult Americans now have finished high school and spent some time in college." The median education level in 1972 is 12.2 years.

In 1940, the enrollment rate in higher education—i.e., the ratio of undergraduate degree-credit enrollment to the population aged 18 to 21—was 15 percent. By 1970, that figure was 50 percent of a much larger population. Graduate school enrollments rose in even larger proportion. Graduate degree-credit enrollment was equal to a mere 1.5 percent of the population age 22 to 24 in 1940. By 1970, it had risen to almost 10 percent.

It helps to recall the total numbers, the total enrollment in all institutions reporting to the U. S. Office of Education. In 1940, total enrollment was 1.6 million students. Total enrollment in 1970 was 8.5 million students. These numbers emphasize another characteristic of our system of higher education—its egalitarianism. Socio-economic status does affect access and success, but probably much less than anywhere else in the world.

There is no mystery about how or why this growth occurred. Education was made a mass phenomenon because we were willing to pay for it, first through the G.I. bill, and then through public and private funds made more ample by rising per capita incomes. In short, we were willing to invest in new buildings, in large campuses, in generous support for graduate study and in support budgets for students and institutions. All this did not happen in a policy vacuum. Higher education, through its teaching, research and service functions, was responding to national purpose: first it was meeting the educational needs of war veterans and later the nation's need for scientific, technical and defense skills. NDEA, lest we forget, stands for National Defense Education Act.

One important consequence to the nation of this increased enrollment, as recently shown by a National Bureau of Economic Research study for the Carnegie Commission (NBER Occasional Paper 118), was a significant reduction in the loss of talent,

as measured by the percentage of high school graduates who enter college at various ability levels.

And finally, our institutions of higher education achieved this record of growth and egalitarianism while retaining, indeed augmenting, their quality. It is a remarkable record of success, success in responding to national need and purpose.

Ironically, success has generated some new problems and illuminated some old ones:

- Justifiable pride in the achievements of our mass system is giving way to complaints about impersonal instruction.
- Delight with the rapid expansion of graduate work has become a lament that undergraduates are being neglected.
- Enthusiasm for financial support for graduate students has been soured by complaints that it is mainly a method of exploiting labor.
- Patriotic feelings that accompanied scientific work for the federal government have been supplanted by feelings of guilt about complicity of a large education establishment with the military-industrial complex.
- The autonomy of our institutions, which made their excellence possible, is now criticized as an unfair, clumsy and expensive form of governance.
- What academics laud as a reduction in loss of talent is being criticized as a new form of waste. We are now accused of giving a college education to many more people than need it for the labor market.
- The question arises about the large institutions which performed admirably in absorbing so many students, thus producing new forms of irritation: Is more better?

"From a growth-oriented society, giving relatively clear professional, scientific and enrollment missions to higher education, we are moving toward a society forced to come to terms with growth. We are becoming concerned about the effects of growth on the quality of life."

COMING TO TERMS

The larger setting, within which the successful growth in higher education and its consequent problems have occurred, served to intensify and to complicate those problems. From a growth-oriented society, giving relatively clear professional, scientific and enrollment missions to higher education, we are moving toward a society forced to come to

terms with growth. We are becoming concerned about the effects of growth on the quality of life. Instead of simple growth, we want desirable growth.

In some obvious ways, we no longer feel as dependent upon higher education as we did just a few years ago; but in other ways we are more dependent on higher education than ever. We look to it to extend opportunity to those still excluded and for help with the complex problems of growth whose solution will require even more sophisticated technology and training. We are perplexed by the many criticisms of higher education and generally unimpressed by the responses.

Regard for the college was once similar to regard for one of its ancestors, the church. But on the campus and in the society at large the old reverential attitude toward higher education is disappearing. Although a new attitude has not yet emerged, an unquestioning supportive attitude is all but gone, and as a result the burden of proof about the value of education has shifted. Addressing himself to a similar phenomenon in Canada, Colin Mackay, Executive Director of the Canadian Association of Colleges and Universities, last week described it this way: ". . . society, having concluded that higher education became the pampered pet of politicians, is anxious to throw the dog out of doors to seek shelter in the all-but-forgotten dog-house."

If all the recent studies, reports, speeches, books and legislative actions on the problems of higher education are sent out at the same time, there will be no room in the dog-house for the dog. Nor does all this reading matter offer clear directions on how to get higher education back indoors. It contains many criticisms that institutions put too much emphasis on graduate education followed by the actions of legislators in North Carolina, California and probably in states between, creating new universities. Various reports of the task forces and commissions reflect similar conflicts. They deplore the emphasis on credentials, but are at the same time concerned about the cost of dropouts; they advocate diversity which is costly, and economy, which presumably is not; they support autonomy of institutions, but

support policies which will shift authority off campus.

It is hard enough to try to keep track of all of these developments, let alone reconcile them. But I believe that in these gropings for a new attitude, we can identify three underlying elements which eventually will shape the others. First, there are the views of those who knew what good education is and who are most concerned about its future quality. Put much too simply, their concern, as expressed in some of the objections I noted earlier, is that the great growth in higher education has tended to pollute it. Somewhat disenchanted with what mass higher education has become, they want it restored to human scale, they want it to be better. To the extent that they have a program, it tends to be procedural, and it is put in terms of diversity, attention to individual development, humanized learning, creativity, responsiveness. In policy terms, those who hold these views are seeking high quality and diversity on both the public and the private side.

Not everyone is groping for a new attitude toward higher education. Some people have just come to the old one. This is the second underlying element, namely, that those still excluded from it want access to the middle class. For them, the problem of higher education is not impersonal learning, but insufficient growth, for with growth comes access. When only a few people could afford to go to college, there were no outcries of dehumanized learning. Those who still cannot afford to go remind us that disenchantment with growth motivates those who have made it, but it is growth and development that appeal to those who have not. In short, higher education is becoming part of a larger struggle, one which occurs when rising per capita income affords mass access, and brings concerns about quality from those who are enjoying the benefits of growth and demands for access from those who are still trying to get it. Their program is extending the opportunity for access.

The third underlying element in the developing situation is the growing movement to redistribute the costs of higher education by moving public

systems closer to full cost pricing. That idea is not one of those gems privately polished in the inner circles of some Chamber of Commerce. It is being advanced by young economists on your faculties. One of the many ironies in our recent experience is that at the very time the campuses were accused of radicalism and worse, faculty members were making respectable the idea of applying market methods to the most important public service, education.

The growing cost of higher education—from 1.1 percent of GNP in 1960 to 2.5 percent in 1970—made inevitable that it should become the object of scrutiny. The decline in the old reverential attitude toward higher education made it vulnerable to what had heretofore been regarded as a rather weak, shortsighted argument: that the benefits of higher education are essentially private.

Today this argument seems to be in the ascendency. The arguments that higher education resources are not allocated as equitably, or used as efficiently as they should be, have little effective opposition. At the same time there is growing recognition of the serious consequences for some private institutions of the tuition gap in our two price system. Actually, it is not necessary to rely on these arguments to increase tuition in state systems. A strong incentive to do so is provided by the basic grant program of the Education Amendments of 1972.

DIVERGENT GOALS

If this analysis is correct, in the coming months and years public policy toward higher education will be shaped by efforts: (1) to move public systems closer to full cost pricing; (2) to have high quality institutions, both public and private; and (3) to extend access. Every campus faces some access, quality and cost conflicts. Indeed, the reconciliation of divergent goals is a continuing activity in higher education. But the formal resolution of these goals is becoming a major new policy issue in many, perhaps most, states.

It seems fairly safe to predict, as most members of a national panel consulted by WICHE recently did,

that as a result of the efforts of state governments, within 10 years "students will pay a greater proportion of the cost of post-secondary education." Would the panel be willing to predict with the same assurance that opportunity for access will be extended, and quality protected? That question was not posed, so we do not know. We do know that all three will be advocated, and we can predict that how they are reconciled will depend in considerable part on whether colleges and universities can unite to exert leadership influence in support of principled, difficult policy choices. We can also predict that a tactic of low profile, or of bickering, given present public attitudes, will probably yield the priority ranking of: full cost pricing, first; high quality, a not-so-close second; extending access, a distant third.

That result will not be what the language of a full cost pricing proposal says, or what its thoughtful advocates intend, but that is the likely eventual result.

Can colleges and universities exert leadership in support of a more principled reconciliation of these partially conflicting goals? It is much too early to tell. There are hopeful but still highly fragile signs in the states of Washington, New York and undoubtedly others that I do not know about.

Although the basic elements of this emerging policy issue are similar in most states, the local conditions vary enough to make impossible generalizations about the substantive choices that will emerge. Where colleges and universities seem able to exert leadership influence, however, it is because they can create an atmosphere conducive to trust among all institutions, public and private, and are able to agree that life in the steady state requires cooperation and probably market sharing.

Major policy conflicts over quality, access and cost are not new to the Land-Grant Colleges. That is what most of their early history was about. This time, however, instead of the Land-Grant Colleges being the outsiders trying to claw their way into higher education, they are in a strong position. From the perspec-

tive of many private institutions, the Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities are in the establishment position.

Whether you agree with that assessment or not it makes good sense for the Land-Grant Institutions and other State Institutions to be in a leadership role in the effort to formulate coherent state policies on the issues of cost, quality and access. They symbolize the educational aspirations of the states. Moreover, the policy conflicts concern, for the most part, the growth of these institutions and their future role. Land-Grant Colleges have been active in providing the leadership in bringing public and private institutions together. I refer you to the "ecumenical movement" in Pennsylvania, led by Jack Oswald, president of Penn State.

THE FORCE OF GROWTH

"... the force of growth, the aftermath of which is creating adjustment problems on campus and off, is bringing to the fore the issue of educational leadership."

At this point I should like to be able to assure you that "life begins at forty" has an organizational counterpart. But if one exists I do not know about it. What I do know is that the force of growth, the aftermath of which is creating adjustment problems on campus and off, is bringing to the fore the issue of educational leadership. But it is not the barren role by which leadership was identified in the past.

During the "golden years" leadership was seen as mediating conflicts between ambitious campus departments. During the recent period of campus disturbances, leadership was identified with keeping the peace. Now, in contrast to that recent past, leadership will be identified in the context of educational policy making. On campus and off it will be identified through the choices it makes. On campus and off, those choices will shape the understanding of a conflicted public about higher education and will lead in time to its support.

In other words, desirable growth depends upon principled choice, a conclusion likely to make one nostalgic for those "golden years" lectures on intensive growth. Like the earliest advocates for instruction in the agricultural and mechanical arts, they were ahead of their time, but right.

American Association of State Colleges and Universities
One Dupont Circle, Suite 700
Washington, D. C. 20036

National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges
One Dupont Circle, Suite 710
Washington, D. C. 20036